



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

wretched fanatic who believed himself to be the Holy Ghost!). Might we not well express our horror at a Cardinal of Rome seeking to impose upon Christians a doctrine of Tertullian's, which Tertullian himself says he had learned from Montanus? We now ask Mr. Power, "is it not strange?"

We have nowhere said that *everything* contained in the books written by Tertullian after he became a Montanist was taken from Montanus, nor do we think Mr. Collette has ever said so, though we shall not presume to interfere as far as Mr. Collette's letter is concerned, that gentleman being well able to defend himself; but when we see that Tertullian does expressly say that he learned the doctrine of Purgatory from Montanus (see vol. i., p. 67, col. 3, at the foot), then we do object to *any* proof of Purgatory brought from the writings of Tertullian after he became a Montanist; and we think it not creditable in professing Christians to quote such a proof. At the same time we think it quite open to ourselves, or to Mr. Collette, to show that *many* of the passages which are produced from Tertullian to prove Purgatory do not prove it at all. One passage, we admit, does speak of Purgatory, but that one professes to be the teaching of Montanus.

We have nowhere asserted that the Church of Rome has defined that prayers for the dead, or sacrifice offered for the dead, can only be for the sake of getting souls out of Purgatory; but we have complained, over and over again, that almost every Roman Catholic controversialist that we meet with, both in their own books, and also in our own pages, does argue, not only as if the Church of Rome *had* defined this, but as if it were a thing so clear that even Protestants must admit it. Is not this the common way that all Roman Catholics argue about Purgatory? They produce a passage which speaks simply of "prayer for the dead," or "sacrifice for the dead," and they expect us to take that as proof of Purgatory! To that we have always answered that these prayers might have been for a very different object besides getting the souls out of Purgatory; and, therefore, that such prayers were no proof of Purgatory, unless it could be shown that the prayer was intended to refer to Purgatory—a thing that never can be shown, because not one of the ancient forms of prayer for the dead ever makes any mention of Purgatory. Hitherto we have found that Roman Catholics were very slow to admit the fairness of this answer of ours; they seem always inclined to stick to the one notion, "there is a prayer for the dead, and that must mean Purgatory;" which, of course, can be no argument at all, unless it be supposed that prayer for the dead *can be for no other purpose* except to get the soul out of Purgatory. And it is this which makes us so much delighted now to see that our argument has at last succeeded, and that its force is now admitted by so intelligent a writer as Mr. Power. We beg leave to thank Mr. Power again for his clear admission; and we hope all our correspondents in future will remember it.

Mr. Power makes the same admission, also, about "sacrifice for the dead;" and we thank him for that too. Sacrifice for the dead is no proof of Purgatory, unless it can be shown that the sacrifice was offered for that purpose to get a soul out of Purgatory. Now, will Mr. Power produce to us any passage, from any ancient form of offering for the dead, *which professes to make the offering for that purpose?* We ask him can he, or can he not, produce such a passage? Until he, or some one else can produce such a passage, we are justified on his authority in saying, that "offering for the dead" is no proof for Purgatory.

Whether the ancient notion of the Christian sacrifice, or offering, be the same as that now held in the Church of Rome, is too large a question to go into now; we will treat that separately again. But if the modern Roman notion be the true one—namely, that it is "a propitiatory sacrifice for sin"—then for what purpose *can* it be offered, except to free the soul from the punishment of sin? Will Mr. Power undertake to answer this?

Whether St. Anthony and St. Francis, &c., were saints or not, is a question which we are not much disposed to judge of. We leave that to God. Considering how many lying stories we have read about them, and how stoutly the claims of some to sainthood were denied by great numbers of Roman Catholics, the question becomes quite too perplexing for us.

But Mr. Power says, "to pray for a saint with the notion that he was in need of the suffrages of the Church, can be no more repugnant to the Catholic doctrine, than it would be to offer sacrifice and prayer for the damned." Can this argument be serious? Can "prayer for the damned" be "the prayer of faith?" and, if not, what is it? Might we not as well pray for the devil; as poor "Uncle Toby," in the exercise of a charity, more sentimental than believing, was almost tempted to? And *can* it be any justification of the practices of Rome that they are *not worse* than this? Yet how natural, in those who quote Origen in proof of Purgatory!

But Mr. Power quotes St. Augustine, to prove, that if praying for the damned can do no good to the dead, it may to the living! Aye, and if St. Augustine lived now, he might say that in earnest; for sure it is by that they get their living!

The passage which Mr. Power quotes from St. Cyril

(Myst. v.) does *not* speak of the invocation of saints, as Mr. Power says—that passage makes no allusion at all to invocation; and the *intercession* it speaks of is very different from what the Church of Rome means; there is a great difference between "intercession" with invocation, and without it. Many Protestants believe it to be very probable that God's people, who are at rest, do, in their prayers, remember His people who are still contending with the world; we have no means of knowing, with certainty, whether this be so or not; some things seem to make it likely; we find no fault with those who think it likely. But it is a very different matter when we are told that *we must pray to them*, in order that they may intercede for us; and this is exactly what St. Cyril does *not* say in this passage; he says not one word of invocation of saints.

We have no objection to the prayer of St. Cyril's liturgy, "that he may make the bread the body of Christ;" we no more object to these words than we do to the words of Christ himself, "this is my body;" the question is, in what sense did St. Cyril understand these words? There are two ways of understanding them; some think the bread is made the sign and sacrament of the body of Christ, and that in that sense it is called his body; others think that it is turned into his body. Both parties agree in applying to the bread the words, "this is my body;" but it is clear that they must differ as to the sense in which those words are applied. Now, what did Cyril think of this? Did he think that the bread was the actual body of Christ itself; or the sign of that body? Whichever way he thought about this, it is clear he must have understood the words, "this is my body," in a corresponding sense. Now, in this very sermon, which Mr. Power quotes, St. Cyril says—"When we taste, we are bidden to taste not bread and wine, but *THE SIGN*\* of the body and blood of Christ." This is a way of speaking that no Roman Catholic ever uses; because they feel that speaking in this way is, in fact, giving up the doctrine of transubstantiation; yet, this was the way that St. Cyril thought fit to speak; and it is, therefore, clear that he must have understood the words in his liturgy, "to make this bread the body of Christ," in that very sense in which Protestants understand the words of Christ; for, after this prayer has been offered, he still calls the bread, "the sign of the body."

Mr. Power is very much mistaken, indeed, in supposing that Aetius was the only person in the early Church who questioned the efficacy of prayer for the dead; and we do think that Mr. Power should not have made such an assertion after reading that sermon of St. Cyril, which he quotes; for, in the very next sentence to that which Mr. Power has quoted, St. Cyril does say, "I know that many do say, what is a soul profited which departs from this world either with sins or without sins, if it be commemorated in the prayer." St. Cyril does not say that these persons have departed from the faith; nor does he answer them from the doctrine of the Church; he merely tries to answer them by arguments drawn from the conduct of earthly kings; and the way the word *commemorate* is used in this passage, applied alike to those who depart with sin, or without sin, goes far to destroy the distinction which Mr. Power endeavours to draw as to the use of that word.

We trust that for the future it will be remembered, that neither prayer nor sacrifice for the dead afford any proof for Purgatory, unless it can be directly shown that the prayer or sacrifice was actually intended to get a soul out of Purgatory. Only let this be attended to, and we shall have few such passages brought forward as proofs of Purgatory.

We think we have some reason to complain of the terms in which Mr. Power speaks of our quoting the Council of Trent in "such a mutilated and spurious shape, that the original could not be recognised." We can assure him we had no intention to misrepresent either the Roman Catholic doctrines, or the Council of Trent. We cited, of course, merely as much as was necessary to elucidate our purpose, and gave those words only which applied to the particular subject of which we were treating.

If Mr. Power is disposed to write an "essay," in reply to our articles on the invocation of saints, we shall be very happy to hear from him, and to defend every proposition we have put forward on the subject; but we anticipate that Mr. Power will find it just as hard to reconcile the decree of the Council of Trent with the writings of his favourite author, Origen, as we have done.

#### FLOWERS FOR NOVEMBER.

Yes; even in dreary, dark November, we are not without our flowers; and though many are dead and gone, others still appear in that wonderful and regular succession which a kind and merciful Creator has ordained. A November sky, however gloomy, cannot deter the LAUREL (*Cerasus lauro*) from opening its bright-looking flowers, as cheerfully as if they were to meet the clear sunshine of June; and, with its kindred shrub the Portugal Laurel, it will continue flowering till the spring has introduced her train of gay attendants. The common Laurel is a native of the south of Europe, and its leaves are poisonous. The Laurel of the poets, and with which the victorious generals of Rome were rewarded, is not our common Laurel, but the sweet bay tree (*Lauro nobilis*), an evergreen worthy of

its high distinction from the elegance of its form and the aromatic fragrance of its leaves. The Laurel has always been the emblem of glory. The crown of Laurel wreathed the conqueror's brow. St. Peter tells us that when the Prince of Pastors shall appear, those pastors who feed the flock of God, taking care of it, and being made *patterns for the flock*, shall receive a never-fading crown of glory. Of what materials shall that crown be composed which is for those pastors, who are patterns to their flocks of cursing on the Sabbath-day from the altar, denouncing to death and destruction their neighbours and fellow-countrymen? Can such be the pastors spoken of by St. Peter?—1st Epistle v. 2-4.

The LAURISTINUS is another shrub of great beauty that cheers us now with its wintry blossoms of purplish red, tinged with white. When fully expanded, its flowers are almost entirely white, and in the midst of its evergreen leaves their clusters form an agreeable contrast; dark blue berries succeed the flowers. The Lauristinus is a native of southern Europe, and found on the hills and plains of northern Africa. It was introduced among us about the year 1596. Its ancient name was *Tinus*, and its leaves being evergreen, and like the laurel it was called Lauristinus. Its botanical name is *Viturnum tinus*.

The SNOWBERRY (*Symphoria racemosa*) is another elegant bushy shrub, which favours our November with its small white or rose-coloured flowers. It is a native of both North and South America, but has long since become a favourite ornament in the foreground of our shrubberies. It is not an evergreen, but rather a delicate deciduous shrub. It bears two crops of flowers and an abundance of snowy berries or fruit. The PYRACANTHUS (*Crataegus*)—or fiery thorn—is another beautiful shrub, bearing a rich profusion of scarlet berries, like those of the mountain ash in their winter splendour. They remain throughout the severest part of the season, and only fall when spring provides a fresh relief.

The MICHAELMAS DAISY (*Aster Trides cante*), with its large purple flowers and yellow disk, a native of the fields of Virginia, generally lingers in our gardens to the end of this month, and then departs. There is another herbaceous plant of the same name, but a native of our own isles (ASTER TRIPOLIUM, or SEA STARWORT), a blue daisy, with lilac flowers. It was supposed to change its colours three times in the day—to have been white in the morning, purple at noon, and crimson in the afternoon—whence the Greeks gave it its name of TRIPOLIUM. But we cannot find any evidence of those changes in our sober climate.

If we wish to add a more sprightly flower to our winter nosegay, we have at hand the last representative of the Rose, the monthly or Chinese rose (*Rosa Indica*), whose delicate and odiferous flowers never looked more pure or engaging than they do now, emblematic of beauty, always new. We may add to our wreath the flowers of the EVERLASTING, a most interesting family of plants, consisting of many members—

"That look as infants do, who smile when dead."

all remarkable for the property of retaining their beauty for years after they are pulled, if gathered in dry weather. One of these is the CUDWEED, of which there are nine or ten varieties in Ireland. Their botanical name is *Gnaphalium*, from the soft down with which their leaves are clothed. The common Cudweed (*Gnaphalium Germanicum*) is found on sandy heaths, its stem and foliage covered by a soft woolly down. The yellow species, called, by the Parisians, "Immortelle," and met with at every step in that most romantic resting-place for the dead, the Cemetery of Pere la Chaise, is the *Gnaphalium Orientale*, a native of Africa and Asia, growing wild on the slopes of Lebanon and Carmel. There is something very touching in the display of sentiment evinced by that gay, and perhaps giddy people, when you see the graves, which have evidently closed upon their tenants several years since, freshly decked with wreaths of the Everlasting, their blossoms dyed of a deeper yellow, and intermingled with others of a jet black, and carefully renewed year by year—fitting emblems of never-ceasing remembrance.

There is another plant which passes by the name of Everlasting, the Xeranthemum, or dry flower, which also retains its brightness and colour for many months after it is gathered. The purple, white, and yellow Xeranthemums are popular annuals among us now, and are natives of southern Europe.

Another annual flower, also entitled to the name of Everlasting is the IMMORTAL AMARANTH (*Gomphrenia globosa*). Its name indicates its immunity from decay. Milton represents the angels as crowned with it:—

"Their crowns inwove with amaranth and gold—  
Immortal amaranth: a flower which once  
In paradise, fast by the tree of life  
Began to bloom."

The French call it "Violette Immortelle;" and it appears to have been dedicated, by the early Greeks, to the same funeral purpose to which the Parisians apply the *Gnaphalium*. Homer introduces the wreath of *Amaranth* as used at the burial of Achilles. He was a hero and demi-god; and, perhaps, thought worthy of immortality—not the lot of meaner men. The heathen notion of immortality was a narrow one, an indistinct glimmer of truth, till "the illumination (or appearing) of our Saviour Jesus Christ, who hath destroyed death, and hath brought to light life and incorruption (immortality), by the Gospel."—1 Timothy i. 10.

\* Αντίτυπον σωματός.